



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,214	02/02/2001	Xuekui Lan	VALMET-5210	3652
36528	7590	03/23/2005		EXAMINER
STIENNON & STIENNON				BAREFORD, KATHERINE A
612 W. MAIN ST., SUITE 201				
P.O. BOX 1667			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MADISON, WI 53701-1667			1762	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/763,214	LAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Katherine A. Bareford	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Claims 5-7 are canceled

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/01/11/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.


DETAILED ACTION

1. The preliminary amendment provided Nov. 17, 2003 has been received and entered. As a result, claims 5-7 are canceled, and claims 1-4 and 8-10 are present for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: at lines 3 and 4, "metering bar" should be "metering rod" to correspond to the usage in parent claim 8. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The preamble of claim 10 provides that the claim is directed to a "method of coating a traveling paper web". However, the coating process described does not have any positive recitation of actually coating the web. In fact, at step 7, the claim provides "flowing the coating from the coating chamber into a circulation chamber", thus implying that no coating is actually applied to the web as worded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eklund et al (US 4945855).

Eklund teaches a method for coating a traveling paper web with a film of coating. Figure 3 and column 1, lines 10-15. The web is supported on the surface of a rotatable backing roll. Figure 3 and column 3, lines 35-45 (drum 2). A fresh supply of coating is supplied into a coater head. Figure 3 and column 4, lines 30-40 (pipes 8 into chamber 7 and through duct 11). The fresh supply of coating is directed into a mixing chamber area of the coater head. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 1-10 (mixing with recirculated coating occurs directly after area 11a). The coating from the mixing chamber area is flowed through a feed channel in the coater head. Figure 3 (through the channel provided between 4 and 14). The coating exiting the feed channel is divided into first and second portions. Figure 3 and column 4, lines 25-55). The first portion is moved into a coating chamber area of the coater head. Figure 3 and column 4, lines 25-65.

(the coating moves the area 27). The second portion is directed over a baffle spaced from the paper web to define a gap therebetween. Figure 3 and column 4, lines 40-60 (over slot 12). The second portion is sufficient to seal the gap from air moving with the traveling web. Figure 3 and column 2, lines 55-65. The coating the coating chamber is flowed in the downstream direction while maintaining a pressurized interface between the coating and the paper web. Figure 3. The coating from the coating chamber is flowed into a recirculation chamber. Figure 3 and column 4, lines 25-45 (the coating passes into the area between wall 14 and blade 5). The coating from the recirculation chamber is directed into the mixing chamber. Figure 3 and column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 10 (flow 29 through slot 28). The direction of flow of coating from the recirculation chamber is at an acute angle to the direction of flow of the fresh supply of coating being directed into the mixing chamber. See figure 3. The coating from the recirculation chamber is mixed with the fresh coating in the mixing chamber. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 1-10.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sollinger et al (US 4834018).

Sollinger teaches a method for coating a traveling paper web with a film of coating. Figures 1-5 and column 1, lines 1-20 and column 2, lines 5-10. The web is supported on the surface of a rotatable backing roll. Figures 1-5 and column 2, lines 5-15 (roll 1). A fresh supply of coating is supplied into a coater head. Figures 1-5 and column 2, lines 5-20 (chamber 5 and mouth 6). The fresh supply of coating is directed into a mixing chamber area of the coater head.

Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 30-40 (mixing with recirculated coating occurs directly after area the opening of mouth 6). The coating from the mixing chamber area is flowed through a feed channel in the coater head. Figures 1- 3 (the area above the mixing area). The coating exiting the feed channel is divided into first and second portions. Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 5-35). The first portion is moved into a coating chamber area of the coater head. Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 5-35. (the coating moves the area 9). The second portion is directed over a baffle spaced from the paper web to define a gap therebetween. Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 5-35(over 8 through gap 12). The second portion is sufficient to seal the gap from air moving with the traveling web. Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 15-25. The coating the coating chamber is flowed in the downstream direction while maintaining a pressurized interface between the coating and the paper web. Figure 1-3. The coating from the coating chamber is flowed into a recirculation chamber. Figures 1-3 and 5 and column 2, lines 5-50 (the coating passes into the area between device 7 and blade 2). The coating from the recirculation chamber is directed into the mixing chamber. Figures 1-3 and 5 and column 2, lines 30-50 (see area 10).The direction of flow of coating from the recirculation chamber is at an acute angle to the direction of flow of the fresh supply of coating being directed into the mixing chamber. See figure 1-3 and 5 and column 2, lines 30-50. The coating from the recirculation chamber is mixed with the fresh coating in the mixing chamber. Figure 1-3 and 5 and column 2, lines 30-50.

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al (US 5824369)

The applied reference has a common inventor (Xuekui Lan) with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Claim 1: Li teaches an apparatus for coating a traveling paper web with a film of coating. Figure 3 and column 1, lines 5-20. The web is supported on the surface of a rotatable backing roll. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 30-45 (roll 24). A coater head with an inlet for supplying a fresh supply of coating is provided. Figure 3 and column 6, lines 20-30 (inlet orifices 62 into head 12). The fresh supply of coating is in fluid communication with a mixing chamber area of the coater head. Figure 3 and column 6, lines 20-40 (mixing area 34). The coating from the mixing chamber area is flowed through a feed channel in the coater head. Figure 3 (through the channel provided between 32 and 14). A baffle is provided spaced from the backing roll and substantially parallel to the roll to form an overflow gap. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 30-50 and column 6, lines 50-65. A coating chamber is provided in fluid communication with the feed channel. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 50-60 (area 38). Recirculation means are provided in fluid communication with the coating chamber and mixing chamber to return coating. Figure 3 and column 6, lines 1-25. The recirculation means includes a plurality of flow metering orifices linking channel with the mixing chamber. Figure 3 and column 6, lines 1-25 (orifices 60). The

orifices 60 form an acute angle with the inlet orifices 62. figure 3 (note the angle between the orifices themselves, not the flow).

Claim 2: a flexible blade is provided mounted in the coater head. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 55-68 (blade 48). The blade forms a boundary end of the coating chamber area. figure 3. The blade has a proximate end mounted in the coater head and a distal end extending downstream. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 55-68.

Claim 3: the coater head includes a stabilizer surface to define a part of the coating chamber for assisting the flow of coating downstream and against the paper web. Figure 3 and column 5, lines 40-60 (stabilizer 26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eklund as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Holt et al (US 4396648).

Eklund teaches all the features of these claims except the plurality of orifices linking the recirculation area and the mixing chamber. Eklund does teach a flexible blade as required by claim 2, see figure 3 (blade 5). Eklund also teaches a stabilizer surface as required by claim 3, see figure 3 (wall 14).

Holt teaches that when paper coating and doctoring a coating provided to a coating chamber, it is desirable to pass flow that passes through channels in the form of flow through multiple orifices. See figures 3-4 and column 6, line 50 through column 7, line 5. The use of the multiple orifices and a rotating roll is taught to help homogenize and shear the coating to improve the viscosity of the material and the uniformity of its application *Column 6, line 50 through col. 7, line 5.*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eklund to use multiple orifices as suggested by Holt in order to provide a desirable viscosity of the coating material, because Eklund teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber through an orifice and Holt teaches that when passing paper coating material through an orifice to a coating chamber, it is desirable to use multiple orifices.

12. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sollinger as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Holt et al (US 4396648).

Sollinger teaches all the features of these claims except the plurality of orifices linking the recirculation area and the mixing chamber. Sollinger does teach a flexible blade as required by

claim 2, see figures 1-5 (blade 2). Sollinger also teaches a stabilizer surface as required by claim 3, see figures 1-5 (guide device 7).

Holt teaches that when paper coating and doctoring a coating provided to a coating chamber, it is desirable to pass flow that passes through channels in the form of flow through multiple orifices. See figures 3-4 and column 6, line 50 through column 7, line 5. The use of the multiple orifices and a rotating roll is taught to help homogenize and shear the coating to improve the viscosity of the material and the uniformity of its application. *col. 6, line 50 through col. 7, line 5.*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sollinger to use multiple orifices as suggested by Holt in order to provide a desirable viscosity of the coating material, because Sollinger teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber through an orifice and Holt teaches that when passing paper coating material through an orifice to a coating chamber, it is desirable to use multiple orifices.

13. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eklund in view of Holt as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Li et al (US 5665163) (Li '163).

Eklund in view of Holt teaches all the features of these claims except for the flexible blade as part of the stabilizer.

However, Li '163 teaches a paper coating device, with a coating inlet and chamber, a stabilizer device and a later doctor blade. Figures 1 and 4 and column 4, lines 1-45. Li '163 teaches that the stabilizer can be formed with a flexible blade mounted to the coater head and having a distal end extending downstream. Figure 4 and column 6, lines 40-60 (blade 114). The

blade defines, with the surface of the backing roll, the coating chamber on one surface of the blade, and with the coater head, the recirculation chamber on the other side of the blade. Figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eklund in view of Holt to use a flexible blade with the stabilizer as suggested by Li '163 in order to provide a desirable coating control, because Eklund in view of Holt teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and past a stabilizer to a later doctor and Li '163 teaches that when passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and past a stabilizer to a later doctor, it is desirable to provide a flexible blade with the stabilizer.

14. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sollinger in view of Holt as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Li et al (US 5665163) (Li '163).

Sollinger in view of Holt teaches all the features of these claims except for the flexible blade as part of the stabilizer.

However, Li '163 teaches a paper coating device, with a coating inlet and chamber, a stabilizer device and a later doctor blade. Figures 1 and 4 and column 4, lines 1-45. Li '163 teaches that the stabilizer can be formed with a flexible blade mounted to the coater head and having a distal end extending downstream. Figure 4 and column 6, lines 40-60 (blade 114). The blade defines, with the surface of the backing roll, the coating chamber on one surface of the blade, and with the coater head, the recirculation chamber on the other side of the blade. Figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sollinger in view of Holt to use a flexible blade with the stabilizer as suggested by Li '163 in order to provide a desirable coating control, because Sollinger in view of Holt teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and past a stabilizer to a later doctor and Li '163 teaches that when passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and past a stabilizer to a later doctor, it is desirable to provide a flexible blade with the stabilizer.

15. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Li et al (US 5665163) (Li '163).

The applied reference has a common inventor (Xuekui Lan) with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Li teaches all the features of these claims except for the flexible bade as part of the stabilizer.

However, Li '163 teaches a paper coating device, with a coating inlet and chamber, a stabilizer device and a later doctor blade. Figures 1 and 4 and column 4, lines 1-45. Li '163

teaches that the stabilizer can be formed with a flexible blade mounted to the coater head and having a distal end extending downstream. Figure 4 and column 6, lines 40-60 (blade 114). The blade defines, with the surface of the backing roll, the coating chamber on one surface of the blade, and with the coater head, the recirculation chamber on the other side of the blade. Figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li to use a flexible blade with the stabilizer as suggested by Li '163 in order to provide a desirable coating control, because Li teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and pass a stabilizer to a later doctor and Li '163 teaches that when passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and pass a stabilizer to a later doctor, it is desirable to provide a flexible blade with the stabilizer.

16. Claims 8-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eklund in view of Holt as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Elvidge et al (US 5376177).

Eklund in view of Holt teaches all the features of these claims except for use of a metering rod instead of a final doctor blade and the drive means.

However, Elvidge teaches a paper coating device, with a coating inlet and chamber, and a later doctor to meter the coating. Figures 1 and column 3, lines 35-65. The doctor can be either a rotatable doctor rod or a doctor blade. Column 3, lines 50-65. The doctor rod can be mounted to rotate in the opposite direction to the movement of the web, thus indicating that a drive means

must be connected to the rod system in order to provide the drive for the rod, since it would not be rotated by the web. Figure 1 and column 4, lines 5-15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eklund in view of Holt to use a driven doctor rod as suggested by Elvidge in order to provide a desirable coating control, because Eklund in view of Holt teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and past a stabilizer to a later doctor and Elvidge teaches that when passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and to a later doctor, it is desirable to provide either a driven doctor rod or a doctor blade.

17. Claims 8-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sollinger in view of Holt as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Elvidge et al (US 5376177).

Sollinger in view of Holt teaches all the features of these claims except for use of a metering rod instead of a final doctor blade and the drive means.

However, Elvidge teaches a paper coating device, with a coating inlet and chamber, and a later doctor to meter the coating. Figures 1 and column 3, lines 35-65. The doctor can be either a rotatable doctor rod or a doctor blade. Column 3, lines 50-65. The doctor rod can be mounted to rotate in the opposite direction to the movement of the web, thus indicating that a drive means must be connected to the rod system in order to provide the drive for the rod, since it would not be rotated by the web. Figure 1 and column 4, lines 5-15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sollinger in view of Holt to use a driven doctor rod as suggested by Elvidge in

order to provide a desirable coating control, because Sollinger in view of Holt teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and past a stabilizer to a later doctor and Elvidge teaches that when passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and to a later doctor, it is desirable to provide either a driven doctor rod or a doctor blade.

18. Claims 8-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Elvidge et al (US 5376177).

The applied reference has a common inventor (Xuekui Lan) with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Li teaches all the features of these claims except for use of a metering rod instead of a final doctor blade and the drive means.

However, Elvidge teaches a paper coating device, with a coating inlet and chamber, and a later doctor to meter the coating. Figures 1 and column 3, lines 35-65. The doctor can be either a rotatable doctor rod or a doctor blade. Column 3, lines 50-65. The doctor rod can be mounted to rotate in the opposite direction to the movement of the web, thus indicating that a drive means

must be connected to the rod system in order to provide the drive for the rod, since it would not be rotated by the web. Figure 1 and column 4, lines 5-15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li to use a driven doctor rod as suggested by Elvidge in order to provide a desirable coating control, because Li teaches passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and past a stabilizer to a later doctor and Elvidge teaches that when passing paper coating material to a coating chamber and to a later doctor, it is desirable to provide either a driven doctor rod or a doctor blade.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katherine A. Bareford whose telephone number is (571) 272-1413. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(6:00-3:30) with the First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Other inquiries can be directed to the Tech Center 1700 telephone number at (571) 272-1700.

Furthermore, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


KATHERINE BAREFORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER